

**CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY  
SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**FINAL MEETING MINUTES**

**Wednesday March 14, 2001**

**8:30 AM – 4:30 PM**

**Oxnard Performing Arts Center  
Ventura Room  
800 Hobson Way • Oxnard, CA**

In Attendance:

**GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:**

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

Member Jim Shevock

Alternate Gary Davis

**NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE**

Alternate Christina Fahy

**US COAST GUARD**

Member Lt. Yuri Graves

**MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE**

Member Drew Mayerson

Alternate Fred Piltz, Ph.D.

**US NAVY**

Member Alex Stone

Alternate Ron Dow

**CA DEP'T. OF FISH & GAME**

Alternate LT. Jorge Gross

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

Member Gary Timm

**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA**

Member Dianne Meester

**COUNTY OF VENTURA**

Member Lyn Krieger

Alternate Jack Peveler

**COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:**

**TOURISM**

Member Jeanette Webber

**RECREATION**

Member Jim Brye

**CONSERVATION**

Member Linda Krop

Alternate Greg Helms

**FISHING**

Alternate Eric Hooper

**EDUCATION**

Alternate Larry Manson

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Member Jon Clark

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Member Marla Daily

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Alternate Roberta Cordero

**Absent:**

**GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:**

**NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE**

Member Mark Helvey

**US COAST GUARD**

Alternate Adam Birst

**CA DEP'T. OF FISH & GAME**

Member Patricia Wolf

**CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY**

Member Brian Baird

Alternate Melissa Miller- Henson

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

Alternate Jack Ainsworth

**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA**

Alternate Jackie Campbell

**COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:**

**TOURISM**

Alternate Alex Brodie

**RECREATION**

Alternate Bill Kendig

**BUSINESS**

Member Rudy Scott

Alternate Dr. Dan Secord

**FISHING**

Member Bruce Steele

**RESEARCH**

Alternate Matthew Cahn

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Alternate Barry Schuyler

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Alternate Robert Duncan

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Member Craig Fusaro, Ph.D.

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS:**

**CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE  
SANCTUARY**

LCDR Matthew Pickett, Manager

**MONTEREY BAY NATIONAL MARINE  
SANCTUARY**

William Douros, Superintendent

**GULF OF THE FARALLONES/CORDELL BANK  
NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES**

Ed Ueber, Manager

**1. Administrative Items and Announcements**

**A. Call to Order and Roll Call** (Dianne Meester, SAC Chair)

At roll call, 12 of the 20 voting seats were represented. An additional five seats were represented via late arrivals, for a total of 17 seats. There were 22 SAC representatives in attendance for the day (13 members, 9 alternates).

Sanctuary Manager Matt Pickett was absent. SAC Coordinator Mike Murray filled in for Matt.

Public attendance at the meeting varied, peaking at approximately 35 individuals.

## **B. Introductory remarks**

SAC Chair Dianne Meester welcomed everyone and provided a brief overview of the agenda.

Mike Murray recognized the SAC's aggressive meeting agendas and schedules and expressed appreciation to everyone involved for their hard work.

## **C. Meeting minutes**

Dianne Meester announced that the SAC's November 16, 2000 meeting minutes had been finalized and posted on the CISNM web site. The February 9<sup>th</sup> draft minutes will be distributed to the SAC within two weeks, and comments should be submitted to Mike Murray three weeks after that (April 20, 2001). Mike Murray also reminded the SAC, and the attending public, that meeting highlights are posted on the website shortly after every meeting, and provide a good source to get a recap.

## **D. SAC Seats**

Dianne Meester introduced Eric Hooper as the SAC's new alternate Fishing representative.

Eric introduced himself, noting that he has 25 years of fishing experience in this area, and that he is Vice President of the Ventura County Commercial Fishermen's Association. Eric said that he looks forward to serving and interacting with the wide diversity of people on the SAC. Eric also said that he is committed to getting the SAC's Fishing Working Group together, and already has a mailing list ready to go.

Dianne Meester also announced that the SAC's Executive Committee is currently reviewing applications for the Education seat. She also announced that the application period for the Research seat has extended until **April 9th**. Anyone interested in applying for the seat should contact Mike Murray to request an application.

## **2. Manager's Report**

Mike Murray, filling in for absent Sanctuary Manager Matt Pickett, began the manager's report by introducing Ms. Kiki Foote. Mike explained that Kiki recently completed production of a Public Service Announcement video for CINMS, featuring top-notch footage and professional sound, and had given the product to the Sanctuary as a gift.

Kiki Foote introduced herself as a freelance producer from Hollywood who lives in Santa Barbara and grew up on east coast. Kiki explained that when she first came up with the idea for the PSA, she conducted an informal survey of people in Santa Barbara about the Sanctuary. Noting that most people she talked to did not know where the Sanctuary was, she was inspired to help raise awareness about the CINMS. Kiki explained that the CINMS PSA was created as an awareness piece to get the community excited about the Sanctuary. The project, she said, represented an incredible volunteer effort, involving many more people than just herself.

The SAC and public then viewed the new 60-second PSA, which was met with a round of applause.

Kiki commented that help is needed to get the PSA out into media distribution. While she has some good leads, she welcomed the SAC to let her or Sanctuary staff know if they have any contacts.

Mike Murray reported that reminded the Council that the February 9, 2001 special SAC meeting on the preferred boundary alternative, Dan Basta had opened up the public comment period through March 1, 2001. The purpose of the extra comment period, Mike reported, was to give the SAC and public an opportunity to consider boundary concept Concept 2A along with the existing five boundary options and offer comments on a recommendation for a preferred alternative. Mike said that during this special comment period, written comments in favor of maximum boundary expansion were received from 127 individuals, and a few comments were received against boundary expansion.

Mike also reported that Matt Pickett and Anne Walton would be heading back to Washington DC for a discussion on the preferred boundary for the DEIS. The document, he said, should hopefully be released in a couple of months.

In the CINMS Research Department, Mike reported that Sarah Fangman recently acquired her NOAA working diver status. Mike also mentioned that CINMS was in line to receive \$600,000 from the NMSS budget for purposes of obtaining a new research vessel.

The Collaborative Marine Research Program research recently selected a proposal submitted by Dr. Jennifer Caselle of UCSB. Mike said that her proposed project, "Movement Patterns of Nearshore Marine Fishes in the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary" will involve fishermen in a trapping and tagging program to determine stock structure, population differences and movement patterns among sites for certain target species.

Mike reported that the Sanctuary Naturalists Corps is coming to fruition and promises to be a great success for CINMS and the community. He explained that over 80 volunteers have been accepted to the Sanctuary Naturalist Corps program, and that they have attended training sessions two nights per week. Mike explained that upon completion of the training classes and certification exam, Sanctuary Naturalist Corps volunteers will represent the CINMS on board local whale watch vessels departing out of Santa Barbara Harbor, Channel Islands Harbor, and Ventura Harbor. SNC volunteers will be scheduled, Mike said, on board the Condor, Captain Don's Whale Watch Charters, Santa Barbara Sailing Center, Sunset Kidd Charters, CISCO Sportfishing, and Channel Islands Marine Floating Lab trips. In response to a question from Marla Daily about whether the boats participating in this program would now need additional permits from the Channel Islands National Park, Mike responded that the SNC program has not introduced additional permitting requirements.

### **3. Presentation: Reef Environmental Education Foundation (REEF)**

Mike Murray introduced Ms. Christy Semmens from the Reef Environmental Education Foundation (REEF)

Christie introduced herself to the SAC and explained that REEF is based in Key Largo, Florida. Her presentation, she said, would focus on explaining the REEF program and the progress REEF hopes to make at the CINMS over the next few years.

Christy began by sharing her experience with CINMS as a unique and special place. Divers, she said, are inspired to understand the ocean environment, but unfortunately divers have little education on species and habitat, and there is a lack of data on the environment. Christy explained that REEF brings volunteers to Sanctuaries for educational purposes. Fish monitoring programs, she said, allow for data gathering and information reporting during regular dives.

[NOTE: the slides used by Christy during this presentation can be found on the web at: [http://www.reef.org/data/CINMSSAC\\_REEF.htm](http://www.reef.org/data/CINMSSAC_REEF.htm). The text of her slide show appears below:

REEF's Mission:

“To educate, enlist, and enable divers and non-divers alike to become active stewards in the conservation of coral reefs and other marine habitats.”

REEF Fish Survey Project:

The Fish Survey Project enables divers and snorkelers to report fish sighting information that they collect during their regular diving activities. The Project started in the Caribbean/Florida region in 1993 and has since expanded to encompass all the coastal waters of North and Central America, the Bahamas and Caribbean, and Hawaii.

Roving Diver Technique:

Divers conduct the survey using the Roving Diver Technique, a fun and easy method that was developed specifically for this project with assistance from the Southeast Office of the National Marine Fisheries Service and The Nature Conservancy. Divers conduct the standardized any time, any where that they are diving or snorkeling within the Project area. Divers swim around the dive site and record all fish species that they can positively identify on an underwater slate. At the conclusion of each dive, each species is assigned an abundance category based on approximately how many individuals they saw. The information are transferred to a REEF survey sheet, the only thing that is required to participate, and they are available free of charge from REEF HQ for each survey region.

Survey Sheets:

After each survey dive, divers complete their survey sheets. They will often talk with others about their sightings.

Data Flow:

Completed scansheets are sent to REEF HQ in Florida. The sheets are manually proofread to ensure completeness. They are then scanned into a computer at the University of Miami, and the datafiles are then uploaded. A set of QAQC programs are run, looking for obvious errors and for rare or new sightings for an area. These flags allow REEF's data manager to contact the surveyor about a questionable sighting. Once

the datafile has been checked, the 'clean' data file is loaded to REEF's server and parsed into an SQL database. The data can then be accessed as summary reports through REEF's website ([www.reef.org](http://www.reef.org)) and custom reports and data files are made available to researchers and resource managers upon request.

#### REEF's Geographic Zone Codes

REEF's database are organized by a set of hierarchical geographic zone codes (rather than just starting with site #1 and going from there). This has been very useful for querying the data spatially. If a survey is received from a site that has not been surveyed before, an eight digit site code is assigned within the correction zone.

#### Web Site:

REEF's Website – [www.reef.org](http://www.reef.org) - houses the database and other resources. Anyone can access the page, they do not have to be members of REEF. They can also join REEF through the page (free).

#### Really Learning to See:

Divers and snorkelers who conduct REEF surveys become much more aware of the environment they are diving in. They become more active stewards and tend to get involved more in resource issues.

#### Educational Opportunities [Fish ID Seminars, Field Surveys, Great American Fish Count (GAFC)]:

While divers can take up fishwatching and pick up the ID of fish on their own, REEF does offer several different educational opportunities to either introduce people to the world of fishes and to further hone their ID skills.

#### REEF's Database:

REEF's database is growing quickly, and has become the most comprehensive set of information on fishes in the tropical western Atlantic (and hopefully over the next few years in our other regions as well). As of April 2001, there are almost 30,000 surveys in the database. The data are accessed by the general public who are interested in learning more about fishes and by divers wanting to find out more about what they will see in a given location. The data have also become a valuable source of information for researchers and resource managers.

#### How are the data used? Some Examples:

- The Cayman Islands is one of the areas where REEF has accumulated a lot of data. There is a marine park system there, with several areas that are no-take. REEF data represent a valuable set of information for the Department of Environment to evaluate the status and trends of their fish assemblages. REEF data were recently used, in conjunction with a more quantitative set of belt transect data that was collected as part of an Atlantic and Gulf Rapid Reef Assessment (AGRRA) project, to produce a 'Status of Fishes of the Cayman Islands' report that is in press right now.
- Atlantic and Gulf Rapid Reef Assessment (AGRRA) -- During the Summer of 1999, REEF staff participated in an AGRRA in the Cayman Islands. That protocol calls for both Roving REEF surveys and belt transects to be collected. The main objective of

- this project was to compare between Grand Cayman (highly developed and used) and Little Cayman (little development and use). According to the transect data, little difference could be seen among sites on the two islands. However, as a diver you could see the difference in the number of grouper (seabass). By using the Roving Diver data that the REEF surveyors collected, the sighting frequency of groupers could very easily be seen between the two areas. This highlights the importance of having complementary methods.
- Jewfish Population Status -- Last year, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and NMFS used REEF data to evaluate whether the current status of jewfish (a fish that had been protected from all harvest since 1990 due to extreme over-exploitation) warranted a reopening of the fishery. Because there are currently no landing data for this species, REEF's database represented the only source of data on their distribution and relative frequency. The FFWC and NMFS decided not to reopen the fishery at this time.

National Marine Sanctuaries:

REEF has had a strong relationship with NOAA's National Marine Sanctuary System since the program began in 1993. REEF surveying is occurring in 9 of the 13 Sanctuaries, and the data can be a valuable source of information for Sanctuary management.

Flower Garden Banks NMS:

The Flower Garden Banks NMS has supported an annual REEF monitoring cruise since 1994. These data act as a baseline of information that can be used to document the current status and measure changes in the future. One of the interesting finds by after REEF members started doing surveys at the FGBNMS was the occurrence of a unique color phase of the smooth trunkfish. This is a very common reef fish found throughout the western Atlantic, but this gold morph has only been found within the FGBNMS. It is interesting that people have been diving and doing research at the Sanctuary for 20 years, but no one ever noticed it before we really started looking.

Florida Keys NMS:

The FKNMS has a tremendous amount of REEF data. As of April 2001, there have been 6,630 surveys conducted within the Sanctuary. This has enable several researchers to use the data.

FKNMS Zone Performance Monitoring Program:

In 1997, the FKNMS implemented a series of no-take zones and contracted REEF to use its Advanced Assessment Team (AAT; REEF's most experienced surveyors) to conduct annual monitoring at 37 sites along the length of the Keys. The FKNMS identified the sites, and they have been monitored each October since 1997. The monitoring sites are distributed along the length of the Keys. They are monitored by REEF's AAT during two weeks each October.

2000 Results at FKNMS:

286 RDT Surveys at 37 sites; 244 Fish Species Documented

Reporting Frequency- Inside and Outside a Marine Reserve:

An example of the type of analysis we have done with the FK data. Because REEF happened to begin in the Keys, we were fortunate to have a lot of pre-reserve data. This is important when trying to evaluate the effect harvest restrictions are having. In the case of this graph, two sites are shown, the one on the left was designated a no-take area in 1997 and the one on the right is adjacent to the no-take area and has not had any change in restrictions. The average abundance score, indicated by the number above the arrows, increased in the no-take site and decrease in the open area. This was only two years after the reserve went into effect. Over time, we may expect this to gradually increase and level out due to spill over.

#### Biogeography of the FKNMS Living Marine Resources:

The initial work with the Biogeography office has led to a partnership that will work over the next several years to evaluate biogeography-related questions using the FKNMS REEF data. The project objectives:

- Define, quantify, and analyze habitat diversity and reef fish distribution and community structure.
- Correlate reef fish distribution and abundance with benthic habitat parameters
- Develop predictive habitat affinity models for selected fish species

#### Benthic Habitat Diversity Index - Calculation

After mapping species distributions, the next step will be to evaluate the benthic habitat diversity using benthic maps and statistical algorithms. The diversity value,  $H'$  or the Shannon-Weiner value, can be calculated for different size circles that radiate from a survey location. The last step will then be to use the benthic habitat and fish information to develop predictive models to better understand what is important and not so important for a particular fish species.

#### REEF in the CINMS:

To date, we have 268 surveys from the CINMS (although the day after this presentation was given to the SAC we conducted a survey cruise and collected 81 surveys on Anacapa and Santa Cruz). REEF would like to:

- 1) Work with the local dive community to increase the individual survey effort on a year-round basis. We are working with the CINMS Education Coordinators on this.
- 2) Set up an annual or semi-annual monitoring effort similar to our AAT contract with the FKNMS. This would ensure a minimum amount of survey effort with the Sanctuary each year and would enable the Sanctuary to direct effort to particular locations.

Mike Murray thanked Christy, and commented that REEF has come a long way. Mike asked how many divers the 268 CINMS surveys were conducted by. Christie responded that some divers conduct several surveys annually. A goal for CINMS might be 500 or more surveys a year, she said.

Jim Shevock asked what the data processing timeline is. Christy replied that it is about, 4-8 weeks to process the forms into to database.

Eric Hooper asked have if REEF has contacted with local charter boats. Christy said yes, that to some extent, and added that some local dive masters have participated in the training as well. Eric



suggested putting REEF fish count information on charter boats to increase participation. Christy also mentioned that REEF has hired an educational staff person to help reach out to individual dive shops and operations.

#### **4. Marine Reserves Process Update**

##### **A. MRWG Process Update**

Sean Hastings provided an update on where the process is at with the Marine Reserves Working Group. Sean mentioned that some of the challenging issue the working group has been working on in order to clear the way to resume mapping exercises include: the idea of phasing in reserves over time, the concept of applying limited use buffer zones around no-take core areas, assessment and consideration of habitat quality in designing reserve options, and how to assure reserves can and will be integrated into fisheries management.

Sean reviewed a draft packet of reserve scenario maps – labeled A-D. He emphasized that these concepts are not set in stone, and they exists for the purpose of getting input from the technical panels (science and socio-economics). Sean said that these maps will be an exercise in thinking about the data behind the maps.

Sean announced that the MRWG will be hosting an evening public forum on March 21, and encouraged the SAC to come and participate. He said that over 300 people will probably attend. The format will provide for breakout tables at which MRWG members, working with note-takers, will facilitate the collection of input from all participants.

Marla Daily encouraged SAC members to attend the public forum.

Lyn Krieger asked if there would be public input at the forum, to which several members replied that there would be, in the evening.

Sean also noted that CINMS and the Dept. of Fish and Game have been receiving a lot of public comments on the issue. He reported that to date the Sanctuary had received over 6000 written comments.

Discussion then turned to the departure of Mike McGinnis from the Marine Reserves Working Group. Sean explained that the MRWG has decided to replace his seat on the working group because it might have a harmful effect on the group's efforts to reach consensus.

##### **B. Science Panel Update**

Satie Airame began by sharing news from a recent meeting of the AAAS conference in San Francisco. She announced that a consensus statement in strong support of the effectiveness of marine reserves was signed by 161 scientists from around the world. Satie explained that this further validated the advice being provided by the Science Panel.

Jim Shevock asked what Satie meant by a “small” marine reserve. Satie responded that some reserves can be quite small and still be effective for certain species. Overall, though, considering a

range of species of interest, 30-50% of management area or stocks is recommended by the Science Panel for reserve size.

Drew Mayerson asked if setting aside less than 30% was worth doing at all. Satie responded that it can be OK, but it depends on the goals you expect to achieve. For protection of some heritage areas, small reserves can work, while for conservation and fisheries enhancement, larger reserves are essential.

Eric Hooper asked about how reserves could benefit pelagic species. Satie responded that over time, if larger areas are set aside, you will see benefits.

Lyn Krieger compared the situation at hand to that of an open space initiative on land, which she noted comes with a price. She asked, how do we reimburse those that lose? Satie stated that the Science Panel was not looking at that question, but the MRWG was. Sean Hastings said that the Socio-Economic Panel will provide their best estimates on impacts and for economic gains. He explained that mitigation and compensation is on the table for discussion with the MRWG.

Eric Hooper asked Satie what the Science Panel thought of the new report on marine protected areas recently put out by the National Academy of Sciences. Satie responded that the report had not been released yet, and that she did not think all of the Science Panel members had read it yet. She said that the panel had talked about the Executive Summary of the report and agreed with parts of it. Sean Hastings added that the NAS report references and partially draws on the work that is being done for our process.

Satie reviewed each of the MRWG's draft maps (A-D) and noted the extent of habitat representivity in each. Satie provided a handout to all SAC members and reviewed data tables [available on CINMS web site at: [www.cinms.nos.noaa.gov/nmpreserves.html](http://www.cinms.nos.noaa.gov/nmpreserves.html)].

Fred Piltz asked if the design and analysis of the reserves was being driven by consideration of consumptive species. Satie responded that it was not limited to that, noting that kelp and eelgrass, for example, are very important to the reserve design process and support many non-harvested species. Fred asked if 30% closure is really necessary to protect sessile invertebrates. Satie explained that the 30% target is driven by habitat (30-50% set aside to protect 75-80% of biodiversity).

Fred Piltz also asked if the recommendation would be different if areas outside CINMS were being considered. Satie responded that it would, but noted that the Science Panel was asked only to analyze CINMS.

Eric Hooper said that he was not aware that the MRWG had agreed to 30% as a target. Satie explained that the MRWG had not, but the Science Panel had.

Has MRWG reached consensus on 30%? No, SP is in consensus assuming stable environment and perfect fisheries management.

Drew Mayerson asked if the 30% figure was derived at given current fisheries management? Satie said yes, with the optimistic assumption that stocks are being managed perfectly outside the reserves.

### C. Socio-Economics Panel Update

Sean Hastings explained briefly the role of the Socio-Economic Panel, and how it differs from the Science Panel. Unlike the Science Panel, Sean explained, the Socio-Economic Panel (SEP) was not in a position to recommend reserve areas, but rather would evaluate proposals that the MRWG develops.

John Ugoretz with the Dept. of Fish and Game handed out a summary table of economic data about activities occurring within CINMS. He emphasized that the data was very preliminary at this point. The table he reviewed “Initial Economic Overview of CINMS,” provided 1999 ex-vessel values for various commercial fisheries, estimated person-days of consumptive recreational activities in 1999, and estimated non-consumptive activities in person days for 1999. John pointed out that anticipated economic benefits are not able to be considered and estimated in this study.

John also flipped through the socio-economic binder of information that is being compiled by the economists for the study, and discussed how various kinds of data is being applied in process.

Linda Krop asked how the economists arrived at person days for non-consumptive users. John explained that surveys and estimates were used.

Lyn Krieger asked if multi-year fisheries data were averaged, and John replied that this was done.

Many SAC members stated that they would like a copy of the binder, to which Sean replied that CINMS could do that. It was also suggested that a copy of the binder could be placed at Kinkos copy centers in Santa Barbara and Ventura so that constituents would have access to it.

Lyn Krieger said that more data is available, and that she will work to verify some of the numbers being provided. Marla suggested to Lyn that she document her questions via a memo to staff.

Lyn also asked if San Pedro’s data was included in the study. Sean and John replied yes.

Fred Piltz asked if regional-scale impacts will be calculated? John and Sean replied yes.

## 5. Public Comment Period

Shari Smith thanked the group for laying the groundwork for taking real action. She said that the public is definitely becoming more aware of the sanctuary and the issues. She complimented Christy Semmens on her REEF presentation, and recommended that work be done to move ahead with development of a common, publicly-accessible database on CINMS (similar to REEF’s approach).

Jim Ruch commented that the Science Panel presentation addressed the need to look at all reserve creations and the need to integrate this with fisheries management. He asked about how the states' Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) and the Channel Islands process are actually being integrated, noting that there is a lot of uncertainty about this. Sean Hastings responded that one basic way the processes are being integrated is by the fact that staff from both processes are being shared between the two. John Ugoretz added that the MLPA has a short legislative timeline, with a public process set to begin in July 2001. He explained that an MLPA master team will look to the MRWG recommendation to guide what happens in this area. The Channel Islands are a small portion of the state process, and feature a much wider variety of species and habitats, John said. John said that relative to the whole state, he did not think the LMPA would shoot for same level of protection as the MRWG. He added that recommendations that come out of the MLPA process will eventually be incorporated into fishery management plans by way of the state's Marine Life Management Act (MLMA). All of these processes, John said, can and must be integrated.

Jim Ruch added that when difficult areas on the CINMS map are encountered by the MRWG, the group should be open to "what if" thinking relative to actions that are or could occur outside the sanctuary.

Dan Pierson said that he has lived here for a number of years. He is concerned about the Sanctuary efforts. From the outsider perspective, he said, consider that there has been an energy crisis, freeway development, water issues, open space issues, a lack of schools, etc. He offered a reminder that these were not issues long ago, but people are showing up, and more will come, and more pressure on resources will come with them. Dan suggested considering expanded CINMS boundaries and marine reserves, and expressed a concern that the process is in crisis. He was under the assumption that working groups and the SAC were operating in good faith, and yet it seems everyone is operating for their self-interest. Dan recommended large CINMS boundaries to err on the side of caution, and specifically recommended boundaries that extend to the beach. He added that people are losing faith in this process, and that perhaps a voter initiative process would show where the support is.

Liz Gorman said that she believes she has a fairly clear understanding of what's going on. Liz said she is a conservationist and realist, and grew up in northern California. She said she talks to a variety of people every day. She expressed concern that we are leaving a mess for our kids to deal with. She also said that she hopes the SAC members feel honored to be on the Council. Liz added that a revised management plan is long overdue, and urged the Council to support an expanded boundary and reserves at each island, noting that they have adequate information to support this. She said that we are playing catch up with protection and we need to do more.

#### **4. Marine Reserves Process, continued**

Dianne Meester suggested that the SAC should consider at this point if they want to send any advice or requests to the MRWG now.

Linda Krop distributed a meeting report from the Conservation Working Group overview. From that report, Linda shared the following with the SAC:

The CWG offered the following comments regarding the MRWG process:

- The CWG believes that marine reserves should be based upon science.
- The MRWG should negotiate in good faith, based upon the technical information that is presented to the working group.
- Marine reserves should include a representation of all habitats.
- The MRWG recommendation should include a network of reserves.
- The reserves should include areas on both the north and south sides of each islands; accordingly, there should be two reserve areas on each island – one on the north and one on the south – extending from shore to the current boundary of the CINMS.
- The CWG members present were in favor of “maximum” reserves, preferably representing a minimum of 50% of the CINMS. (Note: the CWG recognizes that quantitative numbers such as 50% are only appropriate if the above-referenced criteria such as representation are included.)
- The CWG noted that Map “A” provided the closest relationship to fulfilling the minimum 30% criteria for each feature and habitat type set forth by the science panel recommendations. (Note: the CWG looks forward to receiving the response from the science and socioeconomic panels on 3/21/01.)
- Monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management are critical to any marine reserve program.
- The CWG expressed frustration that the public view may not be reflected on the MRWG. The CWG believes that the public is generally supportive of maximum marine reserves.

Drew Mayerson asked Linda how the CWG knows that the public “overwhelmingly” supports marine reserves.

Eric Hooper said that his constituency is relatively small, and are opposed to reserves. Getting the Fishing Working Group together will important, he said. Eric added that petitions and letters are also are on record against reserves, and reporting on public views on the issue simply depends on who you poll. Eric said that the ambivalence of the process needs to be changed. He went on to say that he thinks Mike McGinnis should have stayed in process. Eric added that we have heard very little from Socio-Economic Panel. He said that he is waiting until after the marine reserves public forum to weigh in with the SAC on reserves.

On the issue of public opinions about marine protected areas, John Ugoretz let everyone know that Sea Web had conducted nation-wide polls on the topic. He read off some statistics from the polls that generally suggested more Americans favored increased protections in the ocean.

Christina Fahy asked more descriptive maps of habitats within proposed reserve areas will be provided? Satie responded that the data is available and can be provided on maps for the SAC if needed.

Gary Timm commented that he thinks the meeting next week is very important and good information will be made available. Gary said that it seems that the Science Panel data supporting reserves is overwhelming, and can't be ignored regardless of the socio-economic data. The evidence, he said, clearly supports that below a certain level that reserves will not accomplish their intended goals. He said he agrees with Linda Krop. He suggested that the SAC could send a preliminary message to MRWG that based on what we know now, we're prepared to support the science.

Lyn Krieger commented that it has already been agreed all information will be considered, not one element to the exclusion of another. She cautioned that the SAC should be careful about what is supported at this stage, otherwise there will be a lot of problematic process issues to address. Gary Timm clarified that he did not mean to suggest that socio-economic data be excluded from consideration.

Linda – certain threshold of science can not be ignored. We do need to consider all information, we should focus our effort on getting our constituents out next week.

Greg Helms clarified the MRWG is addressing multiple goals, and not necessarily trying to balance the goals.

Gary Davis pointed out that thus far the MRWG has reached the most agreement on Concept D, but in terms of meeting the biological goals the MRWG set, it accomplishes nothing.

Eric Hooper commented that no one is saying science should be disregarded, and everyone he talks to agrees to this, but Science is not the overriding decision factor. Concept D would help accomplish an important monitoring goal, he said.

Mike Murray expressed concern about some comments he's heard today, specifically the idea that science data and process is more important than socio-economic. He said he could understand how it might look like more emphasis is being placed on the Science Panel side of things, given the way they work and the media attention attracted, etc. He asked that SAC members keep in mind the different way the economists have had to organize themselves and go about their work, noting that they came into this with far less data available off the shelf.

Drew Mayerson suggested that it's premature for the SAC to support anything right now.

Jeannette Webber suggested that the Socio-Economic Panel might give some thought to where are fish catch numbers now relative to how things have changed over time, and how they might change in the future. She said that she is interested in sustainability, and that understanding past histories and future projections is important.

Linda Krop suggested that an important part of the socio-economic picture is the non-consumptive recreational users, which are difficult to measure in terms of use and expected benefits.

Lyn Krieger said that thought the use of economic multipliers, you can make estimates that get at some of that.

Jim Schevock pointed out that one way this is done elsewhere in terrestrial environments is to survey non-consumptive users on their “willingness to pay” to see an area set aside or protected.

Eric Hooper stated that the Status of the Resource Report previously presented at UCSB was unsatisfactory. Fishery closures, he said, should not be based on that kind of work. Some fisheries have declined, he said, because of market factors rather than environmental changes, and people need to understand this.

Dianne Meester asked the SAC again what if any guidance they want to provide to MRWG at the time.

Jim Brye asked if the MRWG has been considering the costs of monitoring. Sean Hastings said yes, and reviewed the MRWG’s list of draft implementation recommendations concerning monitoring and management. Marla added that while consideration of these costs would be required for implementation, the MRWG itself had not been looking at actual numbers.

Drew Mayerson asked what the SAC will be expected to endorse when the MRWG brings forward their recommendation. Dianne Meester reviewed the SAC criteria previously agreed to by the Council, including the three process review questions (did the MRWG complete their task, did the MRWG utilize input from their technical panels, was the process fair). The SAC, she explained, would be deliberating on whether or not to pass along (not endorse) the recommendation to CINMS, who in turn will take it to fishery management bodies.

Fred Piltz said that down the line, should this come to a full evaluation process (i.e. NEPA process) then mitigation to the fishing industry should be considered. Fred asked if the MRWG had been working on specific recommendations for mitigation, which he thought would be useful in their efforts to try to reach consensus.

Gary Davis replied that one of the MRWG goals/objectives does touch on this. Maps are needed first, he said, before we will know what kinds of impacts and mitigations to consider.

Linda Krop reminded SAC members that a prior step in this process was for the Council to let the MRWG know if we are comfortable with the approach being taken, and if we had questions that need to be answered.

Dianne Meester clarified that the SAC will not be reinventing the MRWG process, and emphasized that the SAC needs to get comfortable with what’s going on and get involved now.

Jeanette Webber said that she is concerned about Mike McGinnis not being in process. She said she sees it as important to include his perspective on the MRWG.

Marla Daily said that the decision at the MRWG level about what to do on that was left to the conservation representatives.

Greg Helms said that conservation representatives considered the consensus decision making approach and the reality of trying to replace an individuals point of view, and decided not to suggest a replacement.

Gary Davis added that Mike McGinnis left on principle, and that the process is diminished for it. There will less consensus than before, he said. He added that consensus wouldn't work if there was a revolving door for each seat on the MRWG

Eric Hooper said that because the MRWG has a big public meeting in one week, they have enough to do to get ready and the SAC should not send them more requests right now.

Dianne Meester reminded everyone that the next time SAC meets the MRWG recommendation is due.

Eric Hooper said that we can use our constituencies to get our concerns into the MRWG meetings up until then.

Jim Shevock said that it would be helpful if the MRWG could include in their recommendation their opinion of how likely they feel that proposal will achieve the stated goals.

Fred Piltz added that we are providing advice to Matt Pickett and on to broader NEPA processes, and as such we should look at several levels of mitigation. He expressed concern about impacts to the fishing communities, and suggested considering giving direction to MRWG to come up with recommendations to mitigate social impacts.

Gary Davis said the one of the MRWG's goals is to mitigate social impacts.

Fred Piltz said that while under NEPA mitigation is not required, it will lead to a better process and help achieve consensus if we work to address these complex social and environmental issues.

Eric Hooper stated that buying people out is a last resort. After maps are agreed on, we should look grandfathering agreements to allow some people to finish out their careers.

## **6. Management Plan Program Area presentation: CINMS Submerged Cultural Resources Program**

Anne Walton began by reminding the SAC that there are two components to the CINMS management plan: regulatory and programs. She said that Programs have been coordinated to focus on resource protection issues, and from here on out each program coordinator will present to the SAC and get details to them. Anne said that where the Cultural Resources Program is concerned, there are resource protection issues to be considered, and that it is not just about



shipwrecks. Anne then introduced the presenter Bob Schwemmer, CINMS Cultural Resources Coordinator.

Bob gave a slide show presentation about the CINMS Cultural Resources Program, and some emerging issues that he'd like to discuss with the SAC. Here is the text of select slides (most were graphics and pictures):

Chumash:

- Occupied the northern islands for hundreds of years
- Channel crossing were made in wooden canoes called Tomols
- Located in the Sanctuary are the submerged remains of earlier cultures

Historic Resources:

- With nearly 200 "documented" shipwrecks in the Sanctuary only 25 have been located
- The Watson A. West: lost off the west end of San Miguel Island location of remains still unknown

Underwater Archaeology:

NOAA's Shipwreck Reconnaissance Program

- Record known shipwreck sites
- Annual monitoring of major shipwreck sites
- Search and locate new shipwrecks

Shipwreck Trail (proposed concept):

To enhance visitor usage and mitigate damage to cultural resources by providing the sport diving community and commercial dive boat operators with interpretive information on sites and diver protocol. To encourage diving community to be stewards of their historic resources.

- Waterproof Slates
- Interpretive Video
- Staff Presentations
- Mooring Buoys

Shipwreck Sites For Consideration:

- Winfield Scott (Side-Wheel Steamer 1853)
- Cuba (Passenger Steamer 1923)
- Goldenhorn (Four-Masted Bark 1892)
- Aggi (Full-Rigged Ship 1915)

Mooring Buoys – Good Concept?

- Would allow for safe anchorage near submerged sites mitigating anchor damage to the resources.
- Labeled buoys would notify divers that the submerged sites are protected and artifact removal is prohibited by law.
- Clearly identifying sites would assist law enforcement agencies in monitoring submerged sites.
- Higher level of public exposure when visiting sites, providing extra level of protection.

Mooring Buoys – Bad Concept?

- Would an increase of divers visiting the sites, increase the chances of damage to resources or illegal artifact removal?
- Mooring buoys would require annual maintenance and period replacement, are the resources available?
- Do law enforcement agencies have the resources to monitor sites?
- Would mooring buoys be unsightly?

Not reflected above are several picture-based slides Bob discussed concerning specific shipwreck sites (Winfield Scott, Cuba), the shipwreck exhibit plans at the Santa Barbara Maritime Museum, the Bridge web site and related CINMS shipwreck data and exercises (see [www.cinms.nos.noaa.gov](http://www.cinms.nos.noaa.gov))

After Bob's presentation, the SAC engaged in a discussion about the pros and cons of installing a mooring buoy system at select cultural resource sites (shipwrecks).

Linda Krop asked if with regard to a tradeoff on visitation and excess exposure, is there any information from other areas? Bob responded that at the Florida Keys NMS, it has worked out well because of monitoring system put in place, and because they picked sights that don't have key artifacts at risk, like small items. Bob added that having the diving community become site-stewards is a worthy goal, and requires education.

Ron Dow raised the issue that the people that would cause damage to sites would probably do so regardless of whether or not the areas are publicized. However, he said, by exposing the areas more people will know about them. Overall, he said, there would seem to be more benefit gained than lost from the mooring buoy concept.

Jim Brye agreed, saying that this could provide another important opportunity for outreach. Gary Davis agreed.

Bob added that mooring sites would not be considered for prehistoric/cultural sites, which are too sensitive to be exposed this way.

Mike Murray asked if there was a Park service policy concerning moorings. Gary Davis responded that they are considered on an ad-hoc basis, dependent upon what's at risk, how unique the area is, costs, etc.

Gary Davis said he liked the four nominations for shipwreck trail sites, and suggested that the outreach would be beneficial.

Eric Hooper said that he disagrees with the concept of mooring buoys at these sites. He said it is like putting roads in wilderness areas, it diminishes the ocean experience. Part of the valued experience of these sites lies in the challenge of trying to find them. He said buoys should only be used for safety, and that he generally doesn't like things being built in the ocean. He expects that mooring buoys would be abused by inexperienced boaters.

Jeannette Webber stated that cultural tourism is on the rise, and that tourists are now better educated. She said that publicizing CINMS cultural artifacts this way is a very positive way to go.

Dianne Meester asked Bob what he would like from the SAC. Bob replied that a more thorough review and comment on the Cultural Resources section of the management plan would be helpful.

Dianne asked the SAC if there would be continued interest in looking at this program area plan in the future, to which all that responded said yes. Because the Chumash section of the management plan is currently incomplete, Dianne asked Bob if he could redistribute the section to the SAC when it becomes available.

Eric Hooper said that he would like to hear more about the issue. It's important, he said, that the islands not end up looking like Catalina (excessive buoys, anchor free areas)

## **7. Working Group Reports**

### **A. Military Working Group (Alex Stone)**

Alex stone reported that there is an interest in changing the SAC's Navy seat to be a DOD seat. With that change, a representative from Vandenberg Air Force Base could be appointed.

Mike Murray stated that CINMS is open to the change, noting that Vandenberg AFB has an interest in CINMS not only because of the management plan review, potential boundary changes, and regulations, but also because many of the planes operating in the Sea Test Range are from the Air Force.

**Larry Manson suggested a motion that the SAC support the change of the seat from Navy to DOD to accommodate bringing the Air Force on the SAC. The motion was seconded by Jim Shevock, and carried unanimously (no dissent expressed).**

### **B. Fishing Working Group (Eric Hooper)**

Eric Hooper said that he has generated a list of 28 people that would like to be on the Fishing Working Group. He said that the group will be open to all fishermen, commercial and recreational.

### **C. Education working group/MERA (Larry Manson)**

MERA is no longer serving as a Working Group to the SAC. Larry Manson suggested that when Dave Long's replacement is appointment to the SAC, it would be good if that person could represent K-12 education.

### **D. Ports and Harbors Working Group (Lyn Krieger)**

Lyn Krieger reported that the group would most likely have another meeting after the DEIS is released. However, with more socio-economic data coming out of the marine reserves process, she said, the group might want to meet earlier.

#### **E. Conservation Working Group (Linda Krop)**

Linda Krop expressed concern about external input on the boundary issue that came from other working groups directly to Dan Basta and/or Matt. She said she would appreciate prior notice of other working group meetings.

### **8. Council Member Announcements**

Gary Timm announced that there was recently a Coastal Commission hearing in San Diego, and that the Commission endorsed CISNM boundary concept 1. A letter will be forthcoming.

Eric Hooper reported that he was recently interviewed by a News Hour TV program, and apologized that he may have said some harsh things about the Sanctuary.

Linda Krop reported that an article in today's Santa Barbara Newspress mentioned that CINMS would not be getting a guaranteed slip from the City when the sanctuary's replacement new vessel arrives.

After some discussion about this, Linda Krop offered a motion that called for the SAC to write a letter to the Santa Barbara Waterfront Department, the Harbor Commission, and the City Council requesting that CINMS be given a vessel slip for their new boat under the same terms as was provided for the Ballena. The motion was seconded by Yuri Graves. **The motion carried 14-0-1.** The one abstention came from Marla Daily, who explained that for issues of parity (considering the fact that the SB Maritime Museum pays full price for a slip), she did not think it would be fair of her to vote in favor of the motion.

Larry Manson asked if people had heard about an expansion proposal for the National Forest. The issue, he said, mirrors the Gaviota Coast national seashore idea.

Jim Brye reported that he recently gave a presentation on CINMS to 80 yacht club officers, from SLO to San Diego.

Jorge Gross reported that CDFG is busy working on fisheries management plans. They may finish the squid plan and nearshore plans soon, he said, and added that there will probably be additional restrictions proposed.

Fred Piltz said MMS is working with Leal Mertes of UCSB on a cooperative agreement on GIS databases.

### **9. SAC Operational Issues**

## **A. Improving SAC meetings**

Dianne Meester reported that the SAC Executive Committee had met recently to discuss this issue. They would like to suggest ways to streamline and shorten meetings, while keeping them effective. Dianne distributed a memo to the SAC from the Executive Committee that listed specific suggestions.

Eric Hooper mentioned the value to the community of having meetings in the evening.

Lyn said that the Executive Committee did discuss the possibility of meeting 2-8pm.

Linda Krop said that public participation is enhanced by having main items after 5 pm. She also said the public is frustrated about when they can and can't offer comments. Suggested that 15 minutes on action items is sufficient, and offering a generic comment period is good too.

Jim Brye said that he is fine with reading background information before meetings and saving time for the SAC to focus on action items. Starting meetings at 10:00 am would work best for him, he said.

Larry Manson offered that it will always be difficult for teachers to attend all-day meetings.

Dianne Meester suggested that one possibility might be for afternoon meetings to start at 3pm, deal with administrative items until 5pm, then break, and then major issues can be addressed in the evening.

Jon Clark said he's fine with these ideas, as long as overall meeting time is condensed.

Jeannette Webber said she is fine with these kinds of changes, as long as we don't lose important items that should be on the agenda.

Linda Krop said that CINMS staff should not hesitate to propose presentations, because information is needed. She also said she is fine with doing more over e-mail, however we don't want to exclude the public.

Gary Timm said that shorter meetings and evening sessions provide a good benefit for the public and non-paid SAC members.

Lyn Krieger cautioned that the SAC needs to work on being clear about what they want to do, because it is very frustrating when there is no action defined or taken.

Dianne Meester told everyone to expect that the May 23 meeting is already planned to start in the afternoon and will probably run late into the evening.

Jim Brye said that if the SAC is striving for consensus, it will take time and we need to start working on it early.

Lyn Krieger said that how we structure the agenda is important, and that we should place important items first and last.

Jon Clark said the SAC should be clear on the goals for each meeting.

Jim Shevock suggested that a briefing paper could be sent out beforehand to frame the issue and the parameters of the decisions to be made.

Larry Manson suggested that perhaps two or three public input periods would sometimes be a good way to go when there is high interest. Even lunch time could be considered as a possible public comment period, he said.

Dianne Meester suggested that it is important to have set times for public input.

Linda Krop suggested that the SAC be flexible in meeting schedules, add evening sessions when important items are on the agenda, try to have set times for public comment, and add some time for public comment on specific issues.

Dianne Meester summer up, stating that SAC meetings in May/June will be substantially longer, but after that we will work to implement a more condensed agenda structure from 8:30 am to 2:30 pm.

## **B. The role of SAC alternates**

Due to time constraints, the SAC decided to postpone this agenda item for a future meeting.

## **10. Future meeting dates, locations and agenda topics**

The SAC meeting schedule remained as previously scheduled:

- May 23 – SAC meeting (to receive MRWG recommendation)
- June 19 – SAC meeting (to act on MRWG recommendation)
- July 11 – SAC meeting
- Sept. 12 – SAC meeting
- Nov. 14 – SAC meeting

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.